

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 11: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. USE OF ABANDONED AND UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for additional facilities, the Administrator shall select abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities in depressed communities that can be converted to National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term “depressed communities” means rural and urban communities that are relatively depressed, in terms of age of hous-

ing, extent of poverty, growth per capita income, extent of unemployment, job lag, or surplus labor.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Use of abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SUGAR PROGRAM REFORM
ACT

HON. DAN MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today myself, Representative GEORGE MILLER and more than 40 of our colleagues are introducing the Sugar Program Reform Act, a bill to phase out the sugar program by the end of 2002.

The sugar program is the "sugar daddy" of corporate welfare. Why? Because most of the benefits of this program go to huge corporate sugar producers, not the typical family farmer.

The sugar program's sole purpose is to prop up the price of sugar in the United States through a complex system of low-interest, nonrecourse loans and tight import restrictions. In fact, the price of sugar in the United States today is roughly four times as high as the price of sugar world wide.

As a result, the sugar program imposes a "sugar tax" on consumers, forcing them to pay more than \$1 billion in higher prices for food and sugar every year.

It devastates the environment, particularly the fragile Everglades in my home State of Florida. Higher prices for sugar have encouraged more and more sugar production in the Everglades Agricultural Area, leading to high levels of phosphorus-laden agricultural runoff flowing into the Everglades, which has damaged the ecosystem.

It has cost many Americans their jobs because it has restricted the supply of sugar that is available on the American market, resulting in the closure of a dozen sugar refineries across the country.

Finally, it hampers our ability to expand trade opportunities for America's farmers. It is hypocritical for the United States to protect domestic sugar production while urging other countries to open their agricultural markets. America loses leverage in trade negotiations as a result.

The sugar program is an archaic, unnecessary government handout to corporate sugar producers at the expense of consumers, workers, and the environment. It is truly deserving of reform.

The Sugar Program Reform Act will do what the 1996 farm bill failed to accomplish. While the Farm bill began to phase out supports for nearly every farm commodity, sugar escaped without any meaningful reform. The Sugar Program Reform Act will gradually phase out the loans provided to sugar producers, and terminate them at the end of 2002. It will require that any loans provided to sugar producers must be repaid.

Finally, it will require the government to ensure that there is an adequate supply of sugar on the United States market to help keep prices down.

This legislation is good for consumers, good for the environment, good for American workers, and good for the economy.

It is my hope that this legislation will be quickly considered by the House.

BETTY LIPPS IS THE ANGEL
AMONG US

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Betty Lipps upon being named Citizen of the Year by the Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce in recognition of her efforts to create "Angels on Assignment."

"Angels" is affiliated with the First Methodist Church in Mount Vernon, Illinois and began in 1991. Since then the "Angels," which is devoted to helping the needy and homeless in our country, have made a significant contribution to Mount Vernon and the surrounding Jefferson County area.

However, we cannot overlook the significance of Betty Lipps' efforts in creating this program in the first place. Had she not given of her personal time and vision, this program never would have begun and the "Angels" who have come to mean so much to the Mount Vernon area might never have been found.

It takes a lot of people and a lot of hard work to make a program like this flourish the way that "Angels" continues to do. Most importantly, it takes one courageous and determined soul like Betty Lipps to get the whole thing started.

To Betty and her husband of 50 years, Bob, I say thank you. Thank you for all you do to make our lives a little better. In your honor, I am wearing the "Angels" yellow ribbon on the House Floor today as a reminder that with a little bit of love and understanding there truly are angels among us. Thanks Betty.

EU BEEF BAN NOT BASED ON
SCIENCE OR FACTS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to commend to his colleagues the following editorial from the May 11, 1999, Journal of Commerce. This editorial provides a thoughtful look at the issues surrounding the European Union's ban on hormone-treated beef. As the editorial emphasizes, since the ban is not based on science, the EU should

give consumers the choice of purchasing American beef.

The United States and the European Union, twin champions of a rules-based global trading system, are heading toward another senseless trade showdown, this one over hormone-treated beef.

Like the banana dispute that preceded it—and on which the United States is now collecting trade penalties from EU exporters—the current fight over beef hormones stems from European intransigence.

In the banana case, the EU insisted that its political ties with former colonies took precedence over its duty to deal fairly with other nations' banana producers. In the current fight over hormone-treated beef, the EU insists that its trading obligations must take a back seat to exaggerated public fears over tampering with nature. This is an untenable stance for a major trading power; the EU should abandon it before doing any more damage to the global trading system.

The dispute has dragged on since the EU first banned hormone-treated beef in 1988. The issue picked up steam in 1995, when the World Trade Organization's agreement on Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary measures forbade the use of bogus health and safety regulations as de facto trade barriers.

Acting on a U.S. complaint, the WTO ultimately ruled that the EU ban of imports of hormone-treated beef is not based on sound science, and told the EU to make a change by May 13. To Washington, this meant the ban must be lifted by Thursday. But Brussels decided the ruling means that more risk assessment is needed, and it ordered up 17 scientific studies. It also said it would announce its intentions this week on how to respond to the WTO order.

Then, last week, EU Consumer Affairs Commissioner Emma Bonino dropped a bombshell into the hubbub of predictions and expectations. Citing the interim results of the first of the 17 studies, the chain-smoking Ms. Bonino said hormone-treated beef is so unsafe that it must continue to be banned from the EU market. "There can no longer be any question of lifting the ban," she said.

U.S. officials were flabbergasted, and rightly so. The announcement pre-empted the so-called scientific studies the EU had launched. It even jumped the gun on the final results of the study it purported to be based upon. And it raised a curious question: Why should the EU plow ahead with 17 expensive studies when it knows the outcome from the beginning?

Moreover, the announcement left major questions unanswered about the scientific basis of the EU's policy. The data behind the interim study results were not immediately available.

At the same time, there is substantial evidence the product is safe: Americans and Canadians have been eating hormone-treated

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.